arXiv:1604.04713v1 [math.OC] 16 Apr 2016

Stochastic Optimization Algorithms for Convex Optimization with Fixed Point Constraints

This work was supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science through a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) (15K04763).

Hideaki Iiduka
Department of Computer Science, Meiji University, 1-1-1 Higashimita, Tama-ku, Kawasaki-shi, Kanagawa 214-8571 Japan. (iiduka@cs.meiji.ac.jp)

Abstract: The main objective of this paper is to solve a stochastic programming problem for which the objective function is given in the form of the expectation of convex functions and the constraint set is defined by the intersection of fixed point sets of nonexpansive mappings on a real Hilbert space. This setting of the fixed point constraints enables consideration of the case in which the projection onto each of the constraint sets cannot be computed efficiently. Two optimization algorithms are proposed for solving the problem. Both use a convex function and a nonexpansive mapping determined by a certain probabilistic process at each iteration. One algorithm blends a stochastic gradient method with the Halpern fixed point algorithm, which is a useful fixed point algorithm. The other algorithm is based on a stochastic proximal point algorithm and the Halpern fixed point algorithm; it can be applied to nonsmooth convex optimization. Convergence analysis for the two algorithms indicated that, under certain assumptions, any weak sequential cluster point of the sequence generated by each of the algorithms almost surely belongs to the solution set of the problem. Convergence rate analysis for the two algorithms illustrated their efficiency. The numerical results of concrete convex optimization over fixed point sets demonstrated their effectiveness.

Keywords: convex optimization, fixed point, Halpern fixed point algorithm, nonexpansive mapping, stochastic gradient method, stochastic programming, stochastic proximal point algorithm
Mathematics Subject Classification: 65K05, 90C15, 90C25

1 Introduction

Stochastic programming problems have been recognized as significant, interesting problems that arise from practical applications in engineering and operational research. Stochastic optimization methods have thus been developed to efficiently solve various stochastic programming problems.

This paper considers a stochastic convex programming problem for which the objective function is given by the sum of convex functions or by a form of the expectation of convex functions and surveys stochastic optimization methods for solving it and related work. Incremental proximal point algorithms with randomized order [3, 5] minimize the sum of convex functions. Random gradient and subgradient algorithms [33] solve the problem of minimizing one convex function over sublevel sets of convex functions. Stochastic gradient descent algorithms [35] have linear convergence properties. Stochastic approximation and

sample average approximation methods [36] optimize the expected value of objective functions over a closed convex set. Incremental stochastic subgradient algorithms [42] minimize the sum of convex functions over a closed convex set. Stochastic approximation algorithms [13, 14, 27] perform convex stochastic composite optimization over a closed convex set. A distributed random projection algorithm [28] minimizes the sum of smooth, convex functions over the intersection of closed convex sets while incremental constraint projection-proximal methods [43] can be used to minimize the expected value of nonsmooth, convex functions over the intersection of closed convex sets. Multi-stage stochastic programming has been discussed [4, 12, 40, 48], and the results [1, 15, 16, 17, 39, 45] can even be applied to stochastic nonconvex optimization over the whole space or certain convex constraints. A proposed stochastic forward-backward splitting algorithm [11] can be used to find zeros of monotone operators.

In contrast to the stochastic programming considered in previous reports, this paper discusses stochastic programming problems in which each of the constraints is the *fixed point set* of a certain nonexpansive mapping. Convex optimization with fixed point constraints in a real Hilbert space is interesting and important because it enables consideration of optimization problems with complicated constraint sets onto which metric projections cannot be easily calculated and because it has many practical applications [7, 8, 21, 23, 41, 46, 47]. Although convex optimization with fixed point constraints has been analyzed in the deterministic case [7, 21, 22, 23, 25, 46] and stochastic fixed point algorithms have been presented [6, Subchapter 10.3], [10], there have been no reports on stochastic optimization methods for convex optimization with fixed point constraints.

This paper is the first to consider stochastic convex programming problems with fixed point constraints and to present stochastic optimization algorithms for solving them. First, the stochastic smooth convex programming problem is discussed (Section 3), and a stochastic optimization algorithm is proposed to solve it. This algorithm (Algorithm 3.1) blends a stochastic gradient method [6, Subchapter 10.2], [28, 33, 34, 35, 42] with the Halpern fixed point algorithm [18, 44], which is a useful fixed point algorithm. Next, the stochastic nonsmooth convex programming problem is discussed (Section 4), and an algorithm (Algorithm 4.1) is presented that is based on the stochastic proximal point algorithm [3, 5, 43] and the Halpern fixed point algorithm.

One contribution of this paper is to enable consideration of stochastic (nonsmooth) convex optimization over fixed point sets of nonexpansive mappings, in contrast to recent papers [21, 22, 23, 24, 25] that discussed deterministic convex optimization over the fixed point sets of nonexpansive mappings. The previous algorithm [22] is a centralized acceleration algorithm for minimizing one smooth, strongly convex function over the fixed point set of a nonexpansive mapping. Although the algorithms in [21, 25] are decentralized algorithms that optimize the sum of smooth, convex objective functions over fixed point sets of nonexpansive mappings, they can work under the restricted situation such that the gradients of the functions are Lipschitz continuous and strongly or strictly monotone. The decentralized algorithms in [23, 24] can be applied to nonsmooth convex optimization with fixed point constraints. However, since the algorithms in [23, 24], as with the previous algorithms [21, 22, 25], can be applied only to deterministic optimization, they cannot work on stochastic convex optimization over the fixed point sets of nonexpansive mappings.

Another contribution is convergence analysis of the two proposed algorithms with diminishing step size sequences. From the fact that a mapping containing of the gradient of a convex function satisfies the nonexpansivity condition (Proposition 2.1), it is shown that, under certain assumptions, any weak sequential cluster point of the sequence generated by the proposed gradient algorithm almost surely belongs to the solution set of the problem

(Theorem 3.1). The nonexpansivity condition of the proximity operator (Proposition 2.2) means that, under certain assumptions, any weak sequential cluster point of the sequence generated by the proposed proximal point algorithm almost surely belongs to the solution set of the problem (Theorem 4.1). Convergence rate analysis for the two algorithms that depends on the diminishing step size sequences is also provided (Propositions 3.1 and 4.1).

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives the mathematical preliminaries and states the main problem. Section 3 presents convergence as well as convergence rate analyses of the proposed gradient algorithm under certain assumptions. Section 4 presents convergence as well as convergence rate analyses of the proposed proximal point algorithm under certain assumptions. Section 5 considers concrete convex optimization problems and compares numerically the behaviors of the two algorithms. Section 6 concludes the paper with a brief summary.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notation and definitions

Let H be a separable real Hilbert space with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, its induced norm $\| \cdot \|$, and Borel σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}$. Let $\mathbb{N}$ be the set of all positive integers including zero. Let Id denote the identity mapping on H. Let $\mathrm{Fix}(T) := \{x \in H \colon T(x) = x\}$ be the *fixed point set* of a mapping $T \colon H \to H$. The set of *weak sequential cluster points* [2, Subchapters 1.7 and 2.5] of a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in H is denoted by $\mathcal{W}(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$; i.e., $x \in \mathcal{W}(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ if and only if there exists a subsequence $(x_{n_l})_{l\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $(x_{n_l})_{l\in\mathbb{N}}$ weakly converges to x. Let $\mathrm{E}[X]$ denote the expectation of a random variable X. Given a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathrm{P})$, a H-valued random variable x is defined by a measurable mapping $x \colon (\Omega, \mathcal{F}) \to (H, \mathcal{B})$. The σ-algebra generated by a family Φ of random variables is denoted by $\sigma(\Phi)$. Suppose that $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of H-valued random variables and $C \subset H$. Then, any weak sequential cluster point of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is said to belong to C almost surely if there exists $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathrm{P}(\Omega_0) = 1$ and $\mathcal{W}(x_n(\omega))_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset C$ for all $\omega \in \Omega_0$ (see also the proof of [10, Corollary 2.7(i)]).

A mapping $T \colon H \to H$ is said to be *nonexpansive* [2, Definition 4.1(ii)] if it is Lipschitz continuous with constant 1; i.e., $\|T(x) - T(y)\| \leq \|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in H$. T is *firmly nonexpansive* [2, Definition 4.1(i)] if $\|T(x) - T(y)\|^2 + \|(\mathrm{Id} - T)(x) - (\mathrm{Id} - T)(y)\|^2 \leq \|x - y\|^2$ for all $x, y \in H$. This firm nonexpansivity condition obviously implies nonexpansivity.

The *subdifferential* [2, Definition 16.1, Corollary 16.14] of a continuous, convex function $f \colon H \to \mathbb{R}$ is the set-valued operator ∂f defined for all $x \in H$ by

$$\partial f(x) = \{u \in H \colon f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle y - x, u \rangle \ \ (y \in H)\} \neq \emptyset.$$

The condition $\partial f(x) = \{\nabla f(x)\}$ holds for all $x \in H$ when f is Gâteaux differentiable [2, Proposition 17.26]. The *proximity operator* of f [2, Definition 12.23], [31, 32], denoted by Prox_f, maps every $x \in H$ to the unique minimizer of $f(\cdot) + (1/2)\|x - \cdot\|^2$.

2.2 Main problem and propositions

The following problem is considered in this paper.

Problem 2.1. *Assume that*

(A1) $T^{(i)}\colon H \to H$ $(i \in \mathcal{I} := \{1, 2, \ldots, I\})$ *is firmly nonexpansive;*

(A2) $f^{(i)}\colon H \to \mathbb{R}$ $(i \in \mathcal{I})$ *is convex and continuous.*

Then, our objective is to

$$\text{minimize } f(x) := \mathrm{E}\left[f^{(w)}(x)\right] \text{ subject to } x \in X := \bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathrm{Fix}\left(T^{(i)}\right),$$

where $f^{(w)}$ is a function involving a random variable $w \in \mathcal{I}$, and one assumes that the solution set of the problem is nonempty.

Problem 2.1 is discussed for the situation in which $(T^{(w_n)}, f^{(w_n)})$ $(w_n \in \mathcal{I})$ is sampled at each iteration n. Let J be the number of $f^{(i)}$. Even if $I < J$ (resp. $I > J$), the setting that $T^{(i)} := \mathrm{Id}$ $(i = I+1, I+2, \ldots, J)$ (resp. $f^{(j)}(x) := 0$ $(x \in H, j = J+1, J+2, \ldots, I)$), which satisfies (A1) (resp. (A2)), enables one to regard the stochastic optimization problem even when $J \neq I$ as Problem 2.1.

The following propositions are used to prove the main theorems.

Proposition 2.1. [19, Proposition 2.3] *Let $f\colon H \to \mathbb{R}$ be convex and Fréchet differentiable, and let $\nabla f\colon H \to H$ be Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant L. Then, $\mathrm{Id} - \lambda \nabla f$ is nonexpansive for all $\lambda \in [0, 2/L]$.*

Proposition 2.2. [2, Propositions 12.26, 12.27, and 16.14] *Let $f\colon H \to \mathbb{R}$ be convex and continuous. Then, the following hold:*

(i) *Let $x, p \in H$. Then, $p = \mathrm{Prox}_f(x)$ if and only if $x - p \in \partial f(p)$.*

(ii) *Prox_f is firmly nonexpansive with $\mathrm{Fix}(\mathrm{Prox}_f) = \mathrm{argmin}_{x \in H} f(x)$.*

(iii) *There exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\partial f(B(x; \delta))$ is bounded, where $B(x; \delta)$ represents a closed ball with center x and radius δ.*

3 Stochastic gradient algorithm for smooth convex optimization

Let $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{I}$ be a sequence of random variables. This section provides convergence properties of the following algorithm for solving Problem 2.1 when $f^{(i)}$ $(i \in \mathcal{I})$ is Fréchet differentiable.

Algorithm 3.1. Step 0. *Set a H-valued random variable x_0 and choose $(\alpha_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (0, \infty)$.*

Step 1. *Compute x_{n+1} by*

$$y_n := T^{(w_n)}\left(x_n - \lambda_n \nabla f^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right),$$
$$x_{n+1} := \alpha_n x_0 + (1 - \alpha_n) y_n.$$

The value of n is then set to $n + 1$, and the processing returns to Step 1.

Algorithm 3.1 is obtained by blending the stochastic gradient method [6, Subchapter 10.2], [28, 33, 35, 42] (i.e., $x_{n+1} = x_n - \lambda_n \nabla f^{(w_n)}(x_n)$) with the Halpern fixed point algorithm [18, 44]. The Halpern fixed point algorithm is defined by $x_0 \in H$ and $x_{n+1} = \alpha_n x_0 + (1 - \alpha_n) T^{(i)}(x_n)$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ and converges strongly to a fixed point of $T^{(i)}$ when $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset (0,1)$ satisfies $\lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha_n = 0$ and $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n = \infty$. For Algorithm 3.1 to not only converge to a fixed point of $T^{(i)}$ but also to optimize $f^{(i)}$, Algorithm 3.1 needs to use an $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ that satisfies stronger conditions than $\lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha_n = 0$ and $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n = \infty$ (see Assumption 3.1 for the conditions of $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\lambda_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$).

3.1 Assumptions for convergence analysis of Algorithm 3.1

Let us consider Problem 2.1 under (A1), (A2), and (A3) defined as follows.

(A3) $f^{(i)} \colon H \to \mathbb{R}$ $(i \in \mathcal{I})$ is Fréchet differentiable, and $\nabla f^{(i)} \colon H \to H$ is Lipschitz continuous with constant $L^{(i)}$.

The following assumption is made.

Assumption 3.1. *Let $\sigma \geq 1$. The step size sequences $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset (0,1)$ and $(\lambda_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset (0,1)$, which are monotone decreasing and converge to 0, satisfy the following conditions:*

$$\text{(C1)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n = \infty, \ \text{(C2)} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_{n+1}} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+1}} - \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \right| = 0, \ \text{(C3)} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+1}} \left| 1 - \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_{n+1}} \right| = 0,$$

$$\text{(C4)} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\alpha_n}{\lambda_n} = 0, \ \text{(C5)} \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_{n+1}}, \frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_{n+1}} \leq \sigma \ (n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Examples of $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\lambda_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying Assumption 3.1 are $\lambda_n := 1/(n+1)^a$ and $\alpha_n := 1/(n+1)^b$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$, where $a \in (0, 1/2)$ and $b \in (a, 1-a)$.

The collection of random variables is defined for all $n \in \mathbb{N}\backslash\{0\}$ by

$$\mathcal{F}_n := \sigma(w_0, w_1, \ldots, w_{n-1}, y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_{n-1}, x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n). \tag{3.1}$$

Hence, given $\mathcal{F}_n$ defined by (3.1), the collection $y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_{n-1}$ and $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n$ generated by Algorithm 3.1 is determined.

The following is assumed to analyze Algorithm 3.1.

Assumption 3.2. *The sequence $(w_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the following conditions:*

(i) *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $m(n) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\bar{m} := \limsup_{n\to\infty} m(n) < \infty$ and $w_n = w_{n+m(n)}$ almost surely.*

(ii) *There exists $\beta > 0$ such that, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\beta \|x_n - T^{(i)}(x_n)\|^2 \leq \mathrm{E}[\|x_n - T^{(w_n)}(x_n)\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_n]$ almost surely.*

Moreover, one of the following conditions holds.

(iii) *$\mathrm{E}[f^{(w_n)}(x)|\mathcal{F}_n] = f(x)$ for all $x \in H$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ almost surely.*

(iv) *$(1/m) \sum_{l=tm}^{(t+1)m-1} \mathrm{E}[f^{(w_l)}(x)|\mathcal{F}_{tm}] = f(x)$ for all $x \in H$ and for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ almost surely, and $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\lambda_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are constant within each cycle; i.e., $\alpha_{tm} = \alpha_{tm+1} = \cdots = \alpha_{(t+1)m-1}$ and $\lambda_{tm} = \lambda_{tm+1} = \cdots = \lambda_{(t+1)m-1}$.*

A particularly interesting example of Sub-assumptions 3.2(i) and (ii) is that, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $(T^{(w_n)})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, where $n = tI, tI+1, \ldots, (t+1)I-1$, is a permutation of $\{T^{(1)}, T^{(2)}, \ldots, T^{(I)}\}$ (see [43, Subsection 4.3, Assumption 6] for the case where $T^{(w_n)}$ is a metric projection onto a simple, closed convex set).[1] This enables one to consider the case where the nonexpansive mappings are sampled in a cyclic manner (random shuffling or deterministic cycling). See Conditions (I), (II), and (IV) in Section 5 for other examples of $(w_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying Sub-assumptions 3.2(i) and (ii).

Sub-assumption 3.2(iii) implies that the sample component functions are conditionally unbiased [43, Subsection 5.1, Assumption 8] while Sub-assumption 3.2(iv) means that the functions are cyclically sampled [43, Subsection 5.2, Assumption 9]. For simplicity, let us consider the case where $(T^{(i)}, f^{(i)})$ is sampled in a deterministic cyclic order (e.g., $w_0 = w_{tI} = I$, $w_{tI+i} = i$ $(t \in \mathbb{N}, i \in \mathcal{I})$). Then, Sub-assumption 3.2(iv) means that $f(x) = (1/I)\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} f^{(i)}(x)$ $(x \in H)$. Problem 2.1 in such a deterministic case has been previously considered [21, 22, 23, 24, 25]. In contrast to this deterministic case, Sub-assumptions 3.2(i), (ii), and (iv) enable one to consider, for example, the stochastic Problem 2.1 with $f(x) = (1/I)\sum_{l=tI}^{(t+1)I-1} \mathrm{E}[f^{(w_l)}(x)|\mathcal{F}_{tI}]$ $(x \in H, t \in \mathbb{N})$ for the case where, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and for a fixed $i_0 \in \mathcal{I}$, $(T^{(w_n)}, f^{(w_n)})$ $(n = tI, tI+1, \ldots, (t+1)I-1$, $w_0 = w_{kI} = i_0$ $(k \in \mathbb{N}))$ is sampled in a random cyclic order that differs depending on t. Section 5 provides numerical comparisons for the behaviors of Algorithm 3.1 with $(w_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying Assumption 3.2 (see (I)–(IV) in Section 5).

The convergence of Algorithm 3.1 depends on the following assumption.

Assumption 3.3. *The sequence $(y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is almost surely bounded.*

Assumption 3.3 and the definition of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ ensure that $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is almost surely bounded. This guarantees that there exist $\bar{\Omega} \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathrm{P}(\bar{\Omega}) = 1$ and a weak sequential cluster point of $(x_n(\omega))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ $(\omega \in \bar{\Omega})$ in Algorithm 3.1; i.e., there exists a weak convergent subsequence $(x_{n_i}(\omega))_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $(x_n(\omega))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ $(\omega \in \bar{\Omega})$. Hence, Assumption 3.3 is needed to analyze the weak convergence of Algorithm 3.1. Here is an example satisfying Assumption 3.3. Suppose that a bounded, closed convex set $C \subset H$ can be chosen in advance such that the metric projection onto $C \supset X$, denoted by P_C, is easily computed within a finite number of arithmetic operations [2, Subchapter 28] (e.g., C is a closed ball with a large enough radius). Then, y_n $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ in Algorithm 3.1 can be replaced with

$$y_n := P_C\left[T^{(w_n)}\left(x_n - \lambda_n \nabla f^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right)\right], \tag{3.2}$$

which means that Assumption 3.3 holds.

3.2 Convergence analysis of Algorithm 3.1

The convergence of Algorithm 3.1 can be analyzed as follows.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that Assumptions (A1)-(A3) and 3.1-3.3 hold, and let $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 3.1. Then, any weak sequential cluster point of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ almost surely belongs to the solution set of Problem 2.1.*

[1] Since all $T^{(i)}$ will be visited at least once within a cycle of I iterations, Sub-assumption 3.2(i) holds. From the nonexpansivity condition of a metric projection, the conclusions in [43, Subsection 4.3] show that the sequence $(w_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies Sub-assumption 3.2(ii) (see also Section 5).

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is divided into five steps (Lemmas 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and the proof of Theorem 3.1). First, the following lemma is proven.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that Assumptions (A1)-(A3), 3.1, 3.2(i), and 3.3 hold. Then, almost surely*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{\|x_{n+m+1}-x_{n+1}\|}{\lambda_{n+m}}\middle|\mathcal{F}_n\right]=0.$$

Proof. Assumption 3.3 means the almost sure boundedness of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Accordingly, the Lipschitz continuity of $\nabla f^{(i)}$ $(i\in\mathcal{I})$ (see (A3)) leads to the almost sure boundedness of $(\nabla f^{(i)}(x_n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ $(i\in\mathcal{I})$; i.e., $M_1:=\max_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\{\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\|\nabla f^{(i)}(x_n)\|\}<\infty$ almost surely. From the monotone decreasing condition of $(\lambda_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, there exists $n_0\in\mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $n\geq n_0$, $\lambda_n\leq L:=2/\max_{i\in\mathcal{I}}L^{(i)}$. Hence, (A2), (A3), and Proposition 2.1 imply that $\mathrm{Id}-\lambda_n\nabla f^{(i)}$ $(i\in\mathcal{I},n\geq n_0)$ is nonexpansive. Sub-assumption 3.2(i) ensures that, for all $n\geq n_0$, there exists $m(n)\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $\limsup_{n\to\infty}m(n)<\infty$, $T^{(w_{n+m})}=T^{(w_n)}$, and $f^{(w_{n+m})}=f^{(w_n)}$ almost surely. Accordingly, (A1) and the triangle inequality ensure that, for all $n\geq n_0$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
\|y_{n+m}-y_n\| &= \left\|T^{(w_n)}\left(x_{n+m}-\lambda_{n+m}\nabla f^{(w_n)}(x_{n+m})\right)-T^{(w_n)}\left(x_n-\lambda_n\nabla f^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right)\right\| \\
&\leq \left\|\left(x_{n+m}-\lambda_{n+m}\nabla f^{(w_n)}(x_{n+m})\right)-\left(x_n-\lambda_n\nabla f^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right)\right\| \\
&\leq \left\|\left(x_{n+m}-\lambda_{n+m}\nabla f^{(w_n)}(x_{n+m})\right)-\left(x_n-\lambda_{n+m}\nabla f^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right)\right\| \\
&\quad +|\lambda_{n+m}-\lambda_n|\left\|\nabla f^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right\|,
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with the nonexpansivity of $\mathrm{Id}-\lambda_{n+m}\nabla f^{(w_n)}$, implies that

$$\|y_{n+m}-y_n\|\leq\|x_{n+m}-x_n\|+M_1|\lambda_{n+m}-\lambda_n|.$$

Since the definition of x_n $(n\in\mathbb{N})$ and the triangle inequality mean that, for all $n\geq n_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_{n+m+1}-x_{n+1}\| &= \|(\alpha_{n+m}-\alpha_n)(x_0-y_n)+(1-\alpha_{n+m})(y_{n+m}-y_n)\| \\
&\leq (1-\alpha_{n+m})\|y_{n+m}-y_n\|+|\alpha_{n+m}-\alpha_n|\|x_0-y_n\|,
\end{aligned}$$

meaning that, for all $n\geq n_0$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_{n+m+1}-x_{n+1}\| &\leq (1-\alpha_{n+m})\{\|x_{n+m}-x_n\|+M_1|\lambda_{n+m}-\lambda_n|\} \\
&\quad +|\alpha_{n+m}-\alpha_n|\|x_0-y_n\| \\
&\leq (1-\alpha_{n+m})\|x_{n+m}-x_n\|+M_1|\lambda_{n+m}-\lambda_n| \\
&\quad +M_2|\alpha_{n+m}-\alpha_n|,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

where $M_2 := \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|y_n - x_0\| < \infty$ almost surely. Therefore, for all $n \geq n_0$, almost surely

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|}{\lambda_{n+m}} \\
&\leq (1-\alpha_{n+m}) \frac{\|x_{n+m} - x_n\|}{\lambda_{n+m}} + M_1 \frac{|\lambda_{n+m} - \lambda_n|}{\lambda_{n+m}} + M_2 \frac{|\alpha_{n+m} - \alpha_n|}{\lambda_{n+m}} \\
&= (1-\alpha_{n+m}) \frac{\|x_{n+m} - x_n\|}{\lambda_{n+m-1}} + (1-\alpha_{n+m}) \left\{ \frac{\|x_{n+m} - x_n\|}{\lambda_{n+m}} - \frac{\|x_{n+m} - x_n\|}{\lambda_{n+m-1}} \right\} \\
&\quad + M_1 \frac{|\lambda_{n+m} - \lambda_n|}{\lambda_{n+m}} + M_2 \frac{|\alpha_{n+m} - \alpha_n|}{\lambda_{n+m}} \\
&\leq (1-\alpha_{n+m}) \frac{\|x_{n+m} - x_n\|}{\lambda_{n+m-1}} + M_3 \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+m}} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+m-1}} \right| + M_1 \frac{|\lambda_{n+m} - \lambda_n|}{\lambda_{n+m}} \\
&\quad + M_2 \frac{|\alpha_{n+m} - \alpha_n|}{\lambda_{n+m}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $M_3 := \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|x_{n+m} - x_n\| < \infty$ almost surely. Accordingly, for all $n \geq n_0$, almost surely

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|}{\lambda_{n+m}} \leq (1-\alpha_{n+m}) \frac{\|x_{n+m} - x_n\|}{\lambda_{n+m-1}} + L\alpha_{n+m} \frac{M_1}{\alpha_{n+m}} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+m}} \right| \\
+ \alpha_{n+m} \frac{M_3}{\alpha_{n+m}} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+m}} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+m-1}} \right| + \alpha_{n+m} \frac{M_2}{\lambda_{n+m}} \left| 1 - \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_{n+m}} \right|,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}
$$

where the second term on the right comes from $\lambda_n \leq L$ ($n \geq n_0$) and

$$
\frac{|\lambda_{n+m} - \lambda_n|}{\lambda_{n+m}} = L \frac{|\lambda_{n+m} - \lambda_n|}{L\lambda_{n+m}} \leq L \frac{|\lambda_{n+m} - \lambda_n|}{\lambda_n \lambda_{n+m}} = L \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+m}} \right|.
$$

Condition (C5) and the triangle inequality mean that, for all $n \geq n_0$ and for all $l \geq 1$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\alpha_{n+l+1}} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+l+1}} \right| &\leq \frac{\alpha_{n+l}}{\alpha_{n+l+1}} \frac{1}{\alpha_{n+l}} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+l}} \right| + \frac{1}{\alpha_{n+l+1}} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+l}} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+l+1}} \right| \\
&\leq \sigma \frac{1}{\alpha_{n+l}} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+l}} \right| + \frac{1}{\alpha_{n+l+1}} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+l}} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+l+1}} \right|, \\
\frac{1}{\lambda_{n+l+1}} \left| 1 - \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_{n+l+1}} \right| &\leq \frac{\alpha_{n+l}}{\alpha_{n+l+1}} \frac{\lambda_{n+l}}{\lambda_{n+l+1}} \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+l}} \left| 1 - \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_{n+l}} \right| + \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+l+1}} \left| 1 - \frac{\alpha_{n+l}}{\alpha_{n+l+1}} \right| \\
&\leq \sigma^2 \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+l}} \left| 1 - \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_{n+l}} \right| + \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+l+1}} \left| 1 - \frac{\alpha_{n+l}}{\alpha_{n+l+1}} \right|.
\end{aligned}
$$

Conditions (C2) and (C3) thus mean that, for all $l \geq 1$,

$$
\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_{n+l}} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+l}} \right| = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+l}} \left| 1 - \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_{n+l}} \right| = 0. \tag{3.5}
$$

Hence, (C2) and (3.5) guarantee that, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $n \geq n_1$,

$$
\frac{M_1 L}{\alpha_{n+m}} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+m}} \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}, \ \frac{M_3}{\alpha_{n+m}} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+m}} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{n+m-1}} \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}, \ \frac{M_2}{\lambda_{n+m}} \left| 1 - \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_{n+m}} \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}.
$$

Therefore, (3.4) means that, for all $n \geq n_2 := \max\{n_0, n_1\}$, almost surely

$$\frac{\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|}{\lambda_{n+m}} \leq (1 - \alpha_{n+m}) \frac{\|x_{n+m} - x_n\|}{\lambda_{n+m-1}} + \epsilon\alpha_{n+m}. \tag{3.6}$$

Further, induction guarantees that, for all $n \geq n_2$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\left\|x_{n+1+m(n)} - x_{n+1}\right\|}{\lambda_{n+m(n)}} \\
&\leq \left(1 - \alpha_{n+m(n)}\right) \left\{ \left(1 - \alpha_{n-1+m(n-1)}\right) \frac{\left\|x_{n-1+m(n-1)} - x_{n-1}\right\|}{\lambda_{n-2+m(n-1)}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \epsilon \left(1 - \left(1 - \alpha_{n-1+m(n-1)}\right)\right) \right\} + \epsilon\alpha_{n+m(n)} \\
&= \left(1 - \alpha_{n+m(n)}\right) \left(1 - \alpha_{n-1+m(n-1)}\right) \frac{\left\|x_{n-1+m(n-1)} - x_{n-1}\right\|}{\lambda_{n-2+m(n-1)}} \\
&\quad + \epsilon \left\{1 - \left(1 - \alpha_{n+m(n)}\right) \left(1 - \alpha_{n-1+m(n-1)}\right)\right\} \\
&\leq \prod_{k=n_2}^{n} \left(1 - \alpha_{k+m(k)}\right) \frac{\left\|x_{n_2+m(n_2)} - x_{n_2}\right\|}{\lambda_{n_2-1+m(n_2)}} + \epsilon \left\{1 - \prod_{k=n_2}^{n} \left(1 - \alpha_{k+m(k)}\right)\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By taking the expectation in this inequality conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_n$ ($n \geq n_2$) defined in (3.1), we have almost surely for all $n \geq n_2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{\left\|x_{n+m(n)+1} - x_{n+1}\right\|}{\lambda_{n+m(n)}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right] &\leq \prod_{k=n_2}^{n} \left(1 - \alpha_{k+m(k)}\right) \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{\left\|x_{n_2+m(n_2)} - x_{n_2}\right\|}{\lambda_{n_2+m(n_2)-1}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right] \\
&\quad + \epsilon \left\{1 - \prod_{k=n_2}^{n} \left(1 - \alpha_{k+m(k)}\right)\right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Moreover, Sub-assumption 3.2(i) means the existence of $\hat{m} \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $\max\{m(k)\colon k = n, n-1, \ldots, n_2\} \leq \hat{m}$. Accordingly, Condition (C1) and the monotone decreasing condition of $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ lead to the finding that $0 \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \prod_{k=n_2}^{n} (1-\alpha_{k+m(k)}) \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \prod_{k=n_2}^{n} (1-\alpha_{k+\hat{m}}) = 0$. Therefore, (3.7) means that, almost surely

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{\left\|x_{n+m(n)+1} - x_{n+1}\right\|}{\lambda_{n+m(n)}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right] \leq \epsilon,$$

which, together with the arbitrary condition of ϵ, means that Lemma 3.1 holds. □

Lemma 3.1 leads to the following.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that the assumptions in Lemma 3.1 hold. Then, almost surely*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{E}\left[\|x_n - y_n\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right] = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{E}\left[\left\|x_n - T^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right] = 0.$$

Proof. Fix $x \in X \subset \mathrm{Fix}(T^{(i)})$ ($i \in \mathcal{I}$) and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ arbitrarily. Assumption (A1) ensures that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|y_k - x\|^2 \leq \|(x_k - x) - \lambda_k \nabla f^{(w_k)}(x_k)\|^2 - \|(x_k - y_k) - \lambda_k \nabla f^{(w_k)}(x_k)\|^2$. Hence, from $\|x - y\|^2 = \|x\|^2 - 2\langle x, y\rangle + \|y\|^2$ ($x, y \in H$),

$$\|y_k - x\|^2 \leq \|x_k - x\|^2 + 2\lambda_k \left\langle x - y_k, \nabla f^{(w_k)}(x_k)\right\rangle - \|x_k - y_k\|^2.$$

The definition of x_k ($k \in \mathbb{N}$) and the convexity of $\|\cdot\|^2$ thus imply that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|x_{k+1} - x\|^2 \\
&\leq \alpha_k \|x_0 - x\|^2 + (1-\alpha_k)\|y_k - x\|^2 \\
&\leq \alpha_k \|x_0 - x\|^2 + \|x_k - x\|^2 + 2(1-\alpha_k)\lambda_k \left\langle x - y_k, \nabla f^{(w_k)}(x_k) \right\rangle - (1-\alpha_k)\|x_k - y_k\|^2 .
\end{aligned}$$

Since the above inequality holds for $k = n+m(n), n+m(n)-1, \ldots, n+1$, it can be deduced that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_{n+m+1} - x\|^2 \leq \|x_{n+1} - x\|^2 + \|x_0 - x\|^2 \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \alpha_k - \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} (1-\alpha_k)\|x_k - y_k\|^2 \\
+ 2\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \lambda_k \left| \left\langle x - y_k, \nabla f^{(w_k)}(x_k) \right\rangle \right| ,
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with $M_4 := \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} 2|\langle x - y_n, \nabla f^{(w_n)}(x_n)\rangle| < \infty$ almost surely and the triangle inequality, means that, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1-\alpha_{n+1})\|x_{n+1} - y_{n+1}\|^2 \\
&\leq \|x_0 - x\|^2 \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \alpha_k + \|x_{n+1} - x\|^2 - \|x_{n+m+1} - x\|^2 + M_4 \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \lambda_k \\
&\leq \|x_0 - x\|^2 \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \alpha_k + M_4 \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \lambda_k \\
&\quad + \lambda_{n+m}\left(\|x_{n+1} - x\| + \|x_{n+m+1} - x\|\right) \frac{\|x_{n+1} - x_{n+m+1}\|}{\lambda_{n+m}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Taking the expectation in this inequality conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}$ defined in (3.1) leads to the finding that, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1-\alpha_{n+1})\mathrm{E}\left[\|x_{n+1} - y_{n+1}\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{n+1}\right] \\
&\leq \|x_0 - x\|^2 \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \alpha_k + M_4 \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \lambda_k \\
&\quad + \lambda_{n+m}\mathrm{E}\left[\left(\|x_{n+1} - x\| + \|x_{n+m+1} - x\|\right) \frac{\|x_{n+1} - x_{n+m+1}\|}{\lambda_{n+m}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{n+1}\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Hence, from the definition of $\mathcal{F}_n$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$), Assumption 3.3, Lemma 3.1, and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \lambda_n = 0$, we have that, almost surely

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{E}\left[\|x_n - y_n\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right] = 0. \tag{3.10}$$

Further, since (A1) means that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left\|y_n - T^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right\| = \left\|T^{(w_n)}\left(x_n - \lambda_n \nabla f^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right) - T^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right\| \leq \lambda_n \left\|\nabla f^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right\| ,$$

we find that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|x_n - T^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right\|^2 &\leq 2\left\|x_n - y_n\right\|^2 + 2\left\|y_n - T^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\left\|x_n - y_n\right\|^2 + 2\lambda_n^2\left\|\nabla f^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right\|^2,\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

where the first inequality comes from $\|x+y\|^2 \leq 2\|x\|^2 + 2\|y\|^2$ $(x, y \in H)$. Accordingly, (3.10), Assumption 3.3, and the convergence of $(\lambda_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ to 0 guarantee that, almost surely $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{E}[\|x_n - T^{(w_n)}(x_n)\|^2|\mathcal{F}_n] = 0$. This completes the proof. □

The following lemma demonstrates that any weak sequential cluster point of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in Algorithm 3.1 is in X almost surely.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that Sub-assumption 3.2(ii) and the assumptions in Lemma 3.1 hold. Then, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, almost surely*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\left\|x_n - T^{(i)}(x_n)\right\| = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty}\left\|x_n - T^{(i)}\left(x_n - \lambda_n\nabla f^{(i)}(x_n)\right)\right\| = 0.$$

Proof. Sub-assumption 3.2(ii) and Lemma 3.2 guarantee that, for all $j \in \mathcal{I}$, almost surely

$$\beta\limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\|x_n - T^{(j)}(x_n)\right\|^2 \leq \lim_{n\to\infty}\mathrm{E}\left[\left\|x_n - T^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right\|^2\middle|\mathcal{F}_n\right] = 0.$$

This means that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\|x_n - T^{(j)}(x_n)\|$ $(j \in \mathcal{I})$almost surely equals 0. The triangle inequality and (A1) ensure that, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left\|x_n - T^{(i)}\left(x_n - \lambda_n\nabla f^{(i)}(x_n)\right)\right\| \leq \left\|x_n - T^{(i)}(x_n)\right\| + \lambda_n\left\|\nabla f^{(i)}(x_n)\right\|,$$

which, together with Assumption 3.3, $\lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_n = 0$, and $\lim_{n\to\infty}\|x_n - T^{(i)}(x_n)\| = 0$ almost surely, means that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\|x_n - T^{(i)}(x_n - \lambda_n\nabla f^{(i)}(x_n))\|$ $(j \in \mathcal{I})$ almost surely equals 0. This completes the proof. □

The following can also be proved.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose that the assumptions in Theorem 3.1 hold. Then, almost surely*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} f(x_n) \leq f^\star := \min_{x\in X} f(x).$$

Proof. Fix $x^\star \in X^\star := \{x^\star \in X\colon f(x^\star) = f^\star\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ arbitrarily. From (A1), for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|y_k - x^\star\|^2 \leq \|(x_k - x^\star) - \lambda_k\nabla f^{(w_k)}(x_k)\|^2$, which, together with $\|x-y\|^2 = \|x\|^2 - 2\langle x, y\rangle + \|y\|^2$ $(x, y \in H)$ and the definition of ∂f, means that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\|y_k - x^\star\|^2 \leq \|x_k - x^\star\|^2 + 2\lambda_k\left(f^{(w_k)}(x^\star) - f^{(w_k)}(x_k)\right) + M_1^2\lambda_k^2.$$

Hence, the convexity of $\|\cdot\|^2$ means that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}&\|x_{k+1} - x^\star\|^2 \\ &\leq \alpha_k\|x_0 - x^\star\|^2 + (1-\alpha_k)\|y_k - x^\star\|^2 \\ &\leq \alpha_k\|x_0 - x^\star\|^2 + \|x_k - x^\star\|^2 + 2(1-\alpha_k)\lambda_k\left(f^{(w_k)}(x^\star) - f^{(w_k)}(x_k)\right) + M_1^2\lambda_k^2.\end{aligned}$$

Since the above inequality holds for $k = n + m(n), n + m(n) - 1, \ldots, n + 1$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{2}{\lambda_{n+m}} \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} (1-\alpha_k)\lambda_k \left(f^{(w_k)}(x_k) - f^{(w_k)}(x^\star) \right) \\
&\leq M_5 \frac{\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|}{\lambda_{n+m}} + \frac{\|x_0 - x^\star\|^2}{\lambda_{n+m}} \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \alpha_k + \frac{M_1^2}{\lambda_{n+m}} \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \lambda_k^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where $M_5 := \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}(\|x_{n+1} - x^\star\| + \|x_{n+m+1} - x^\star\|) < \infty$ almost surely.

Now, let us assume that Sub-assumption 3.2(iii) holds. Then, for all $x \in H$, almost surely $\mathrm{E}[f^{(w_{n+1})}(x)|\mathcal{F}_n] = \mathrm{E}[\mathrm{E}[f^{(w_{n+1})}(x)|\mathcal{F}_{n+1}]|\mathcal{F}_n] = \mathrm{E}[f(x)|\mathcal{F}_n] = f(x)$; i.e., $\mathrm{E}[f^{(w_k)}(x)|\mathcal{F}_n]$ almost surely equals $f(x)$ for all $k \geq n$ and for all $x \in H$. Hence, by taking the expectation in (3.12) conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_n$, we have that almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{2}{\lambda_{n+m}} \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} (1-\alpha_k)\lambda_k \left(f(x_k) - f^\star \right) \\
&\leq M_5 \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|}{\lambda_{n+m}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] + \frac{\|x_0 - x^\star\|^2}{\lambda_{n+m}} \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \alpha_k + \frac{M_1^2}{\lambda_{n+m}} \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \lambda_k^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Since (C5) and the monotone decreasing conditions of $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\lambda_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\|x_0 - x^\star\|^2}{\lambda_{n+m}} \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \alpha_k \leq m \|x_0 - x^\star\|^2 \frac{\alpha_{n+1}}{\lambda_{n+m}} \leq m(n)\,(m(n)-1)\,\sigma \|x_0 - x^\star\|^2 \frac{\alpha_{n+1}}{\lambda_{n+1}}, \\
&\frac{M_1^2}{\lambda_{n+m}} \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \lambda_k^2 \leq m M_1^2 \lambda_{n+1} \frac{\lambda_{n+1}}{\lambda_{n+m}} \leq m(n)\,(m(n)-1)\,\sigma M_1^2 \lambda_{n+1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Sub-assumption 3.2(i), (C4), and $\lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_n = 0$ mean that $\lim_{n\to\infty}(\|x_0 - x\|^2 / \lambda_{n+m}) \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \alpha_k \leq 0$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty}(M_1^2/\lambda_{n+m}) \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \lambda_k^2 \leq 0$. Accordingly, Lemma 3.1 guarantees that, almost surely

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{2}{\lambda_{n+m}} \sum_{k=1}^{m} (1-\alpha_{n+k})\lambda_{n+k} \left(f(x_{n+k}) - f^\star \right) \leq 0.$$

Now, let us assume that the assertion in Lemma 3.4 does not hold; i.e., for all $\tilde{\Omega} \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathrm{P}(\tilde{\Omega}) = 1$ and there exists $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$ such that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} f(x_n(\omega)) - f^\star > 0$. Accordingly, there exist $\gamma > 0$ and $n_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f(x_n(\omega)) - f^\star \geq \gamma$ for all $n \geq n_3$. The monotone decreasing conditions of $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\lambda_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty}\alpha_n = 0$ thus guarantee that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{2}{\lambda_{n+m}} \sum_{k=1}^{m} (1-\alpha_{n+k})\lambda_{n+k} \left(f(x_{n+k}(\omega)) - f^\star \right) \\
&\geq \gamma \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{2\lambda_{n+m}}{\lambda_{n+m}} m(n)(1-\alpha_{n+1}) \geq 2\gamma > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, almost surely $\limsup_{n\to\infty} f(x_n) - f^\star \leq 0$.

Next, let us assume that Sub-assumption 3.2(iv) holds. Inequality (3.12) thus leads to the finding that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{2(1-\alpha_{n+m})\lambda_{n+m}}{\lambda_{n+m}} \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \left(f^{(w_k)}(x_k) - f^{(w_k)}(x^\star) \right) \\
&\leq M_5 \frac{\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|}{\lambda_{n+m}} + \frac{\|x_0 - x^\star\|^2 m\alpha_{n+m}}{\lambda_{n+m}} + \frac{M_1^2 m \lambda_{n+m}^2}{\lambda_{n+m}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the definition of $\partial f^{(w_k)}$ means that $f^{(w_k)}(x_n) - f^{(w_k)}(x_k) \leq \langle x_n - x_k, \nabla f^{(w_k)}(x_n) \rangle$ $(k = n+1, n+2, \ldots, n+m)$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
&2(1-\alpha_{n+m}) \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \left(f^{(w_k)}(x_n) - f^{(w_k)}(x^\star) \right) \\
&\leq M_5 \frac{\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|}{\lambda_{n+m}} + \frac{\|x_0 - x^\star\|^2 m\alpha_{n+m}}{\lambda_{n+m}} + \frac{M_1^2 m \lambda_{n+m}^2}{\lambda_{n+m}} \\
&\quad + 2M_1(1-\alpha_{n+m}) \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \|x_n - x_k\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Further, from $\|x_{l+1} - x_l\| \leq \|x_{l+1} - y_l\| + \|y_l - x_l\|$ and $\|x_{l+1} - y_l\| = \alpha_l \|x_0 - y_l\|$ $(l \in \mathbb{N})$, Assumption 3.3 and Lemma 3.3 ensure that $\lim_{l\to\infty} \|x_{l+1} - x_l\|$ almost surely equals 0. Hence, the triangle inequality guarantees that, for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lim_{l\to\infty} \|x_l - x_{l+j}\|$ almost surely equals 0. Taking the expectation in (3.15) thus ensures that, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n_4 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $n \geq n_4$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
&2(1-\alpha_{n+m}) \left(f(x_n) - f^\star \right) \\
&\leq M_5 \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|}{m\lambda_{n+m}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] + \frac{\|x_0 - x^\star\|^2 \alpha_{n+m}}{\lambda_{n+m}} + M_1^2 \lambda_{n+m} + 2M_1(1-\alpha_{n+m})\epsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where the left side comes from the condition that, almost surely $f(x) = (1/m) \sum_{l=tm}^{(t+1)m-1} \mathrm{E}[f^{(w_l)}(x) | \mathcal{F}_{tm}]$ with $tm = n+1$ and the definition of $\mathcal{F}_n$. Hence, from Sub-assumption 3.2(i), Lemma 3.1, (C4), and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \lambda_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha_n = 0$, almost surely

$$2 \limsup_{n\to\infty} \left(f(x_n) - f^\star \right) \leq 2M_1\epsilon.$$

Therefore, the arbitrary condition of ϵ guarantees that Lemma 3.4 holds. □

Now we are in the position to prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof. Lemma 3.3 ensures the existence of $\bar{\Omega} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathrm{P}(\bar{\Omega}) = 1$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|x_n(\omega) - T^{(i)}(x_n(\omega))\| = 0$ for all $\omega \in \bar{\Omega}$ and for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Moreover, Lemma 3.4 means that there exists $\hat{\Omega} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathrm{P}(\hat{\Omega}) = 1$ and $\limsup_{n\to\infty} f(x_n(\omega)) \leq f^\star$ for all $\omega \in \hat{\Omega}$. Now, let $\omega \in \bar{\Omega} \cap \hat{\Omega}$ and let $x^* \in \mathcal{W}(x_n(\omega))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Assumption 3.3 and $\mathrm{P}(\bar{\Omega} \cap \hat{\Omega}) = 1$ guarantee the existence of a weak sequential cluster point of $(x_n(\omega))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Then, there exists $(x_{n_l}(\omega))_{l\in\mathbb{N}} \subset (x_n(\omega))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that it converges weakly to $x^* \in H$. Here, let us fix $i \in \mathcal{I}$ arbitrarily and assume that $x^* \notin \mathrm{Fix}(T^{(i)})$. From Opial's lemma [37, Lemma 3.1],

$$\liminf_{l\to\infty} \|x_{n_l}(\omega) - x^*\| < \liminf_{l\to\infty} \left\| x_{n_l}(\omega) - T^{(i)}(x^*) \right\|,$$

which, together with $\omega \in \bar{\Omega}$ and (A1), means that

$$\liminf_{l\to\infty} \|x_{n_l}(\omega) - x^*\| < \liminf_{l\to\infty} \left\|T^{(i)}(x_{n_l}(\omega)) - T^{(i)}(x^*)\right\| \leq \liminf_{l\to\infty} \|x_{n_l}(\omega) - x^*\|.$$

This is a contradiction. Therefore, $x^* \in \mathrm{Fix}(T^{(i)})$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$; i.e., $x^* \in X$. Furthermore, the weakly lower semicontinuity of f [2, Theorem 9.1] leads to the finding that

$$f(x^*) \leq \liminf_{l\to\infty} f\left(x_{n_l}(\omega)\right) \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} f\left(x_n(\omega)\right) \leq f^\star.$$

That is, $x^* \in X^\star$. This completes the proof. □

3.3 Convergence rate analysis of Algorithm 3.1

The following proposition establishes the rate of convergence for Algorithm 3.1.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose that the assumptions in Theorem 3.1 hold and that $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is the sequence generated by Algorithm 3.1. Then, there exist $N_i \in \mathbb{R}$ $(i = 1, 2)$ such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely*

$$\left\|x_n - T^{(i)}(x_n)\right\| \leq \sqrt{N_1\alpha_n + N_2\lambda_n}.$$

Moreover, under Sub-assumption 3.2(iii), if there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f(x_n) \geq f^\star$ almost surely for all $n \geq k_0$, then there exist $k_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $N_i \in \mathbb{R}$ $(i = 3, 4, 5)$ such that, for all $n \geq \max\{k_0, k_1\}$, almost surely

$$\frac{1}{m}\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} f(x_k) - f^\star \leq N_3\frac{o(\lambda_{n+m})}{\lambda_{n+m}} + N_4\lambda_n + N_5\frac{\alpha_n}{\lambda_n}.$$

Under Sub-assumption 3.2(iv), there exist $k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $N_i \in \mathbb{R}$ $(i = 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)$ such that, for all $n \geq k_2$, almost surely

$$f(x_n) - f^\star \leq N_6\frac{o(\lambda_{n+m})}{\lambda_{n+m}} + N_7\lambda_n + N_8\frac{\alpha_n}{\lambda_n} + \sqrt{N_9\alpha_n + N_{10}\lambda_n}.$$

Proof. From (3.9), the monotone decreasing conditions of $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\lambda_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $\lim_{n\to\infty}\alpha_n = 0$, and the almost sure boundedness of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, there exist $N_i \in \mathbb{R}$ $(i = 1, 2)$ such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely $\mathrm{E}[\|x_n - y_n\|^2|\mathcal{F}_n] \leq N_1\alpha_n + N_2\lambda_n$. Accordingly, (3.11) ensures that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\mathrm{E}\left[\left\|x_n - T^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right] \leq 2\left(N_1\alpha_n + N_2\lambda_n\right) + 2M_1^2\lambda_n^2.$$

Sub-assumption 3.2(ii) guarantees the existence of $N_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|x_n - T^{(i)}(x_n)\|^2 \leq N_3\mathrm{E}[\|x_n - T^{(w_n)}(x_n)\|^2|\mathcal{F}_n]$ holds almost surely. This means that, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\left\|x_n - T^{(i)}(x_n)\right\|^2 \leq 2N_3\left(N_1\alpha_n + N_2\lambda_n\right) + 2N_3M_1^2\lambda_n.$$

Lemma 3.1 and the monotone decreasing condition of $(\lambda_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $\lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_n = 0$ guarantee that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|}{\lambda_{n+m}}\middle|\mathcal{F}_n\right] = \frac{\mathrm{E}\left[\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|\,|\mathcal{F}_n\right]}{\lambda_{n+m}} = \frac{o(\lambda_{n+m})}{\lambda_{n+m}}. \tag{3.16}$$

Let us assume that Sub-assumption 3.2(iii) holds. From (3.13) and (3.16), for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\frac{2}{\lambda_{n+m}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}(1-\alpha_k)\lambda_k\left(f(x_k) - f^\star\right) \le M_5\frac{o(\lambda_{n+m})}{\lambda_{n+m}} + \frac{\|x_0 - x^\star\|^2}{\lambda_{n+m}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\alpha_k + \frac{M_1^2}{\lambda_{n+m}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\lambda_k^2.$$

Hence, (3.14) guarantees that there exist $N_4, N_5 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\frac{2}{\lambda_{n+m}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}(1-\alpha_k)\lambda_k\left(f(x_k) - f^\star\right) \le M_5\frac{o(\lambda_{n+m})}{\lambda_{n+m}} + N_4\frac{\alpha_n}{\lambda_n} + N_5\lambda_n.$$

Since $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to 0, there exists $n_5 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $1 - \alpha_n \ge 1/2$ for all $n \ge n_5$. From the monotone decreasing condition of $(\lambda_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and the existence of $n_6 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f(x_n) - f^\star \ge 0$ almost surely for all $n \ge n_6$, we have that, for all $n \ge k_0 := \max\{n_5, n_6\}$, almost surely

$$\frac{1}{m}\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} f(x_k) - f^\star \le \frac{M_5}{m}\frac{o(\lambda_{n+m})}{\lambda_{n+m}} + \frac{N_4}{m}\frac{\alpha_n}{\lambda_n} + \frac{N_5}{m}\lambda_n.$$

Let us assume that Sub-assumption 3.2(iv) holds. Then, (3.15) guarantees that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
&2(1-\alpha_{n+m})\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\left(f^{(w_k)}(x_n) - f^{(w_k)}(x^\star)\right) \\
&\le M_5\frac{\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|}{\lambda_{n+m}} + N_4\frac{\alpha_n}{\lambda_n} + N_5\lambda_n + 2M_1(1-\alpha_{n+m})\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\|x_n - x_k\|.
\end{aligned}$$

From (3.8), $\|x_{n+1} - y_n\| = \alpha_n\|x_0 - y_n\|$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$, and the triangle inequality, there exist $\bar{n}_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\bar{N}_i \in \mathbb{R}$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ such that, for all $n \ge \bar{n}_1$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_n - x_{n+1}\| &\le \|x_n - y_n\| + \|y_n - x_{n+1}\| \\
&\le \sqrt{\bar{N}_1\alpha_n + \bar{N}_2\lambda_n} + \bar{N}_3\alpha_n,
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with the triangle inequality and the monotone decreasing conditions of $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\lambda_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, means that, for all $n \ge \bar{n}_1$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\|x_n - x_k\| &\le \sum_{j=0}^{m-1}(m-j)\|x_{n+j} - x_{n+j+1}\| \\
&\le \sum_{j=0}^{m-1}(m-j)\left(\sqrt{\bar{N}_1\alpha_{n+j} + \bar{N}_2\lambda_{n+j}} + \bar{N}_3\alpha_{n+j}\right) \\
&\le \frac{m(m+1)}{2}\left(\sqrt{\bar{N}_1\alpha_n + \bar{N}_2\lambda_n} + \bar{N}_3\alpha_n\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to 0, there exist $a \in (0,1)$ and $\bar{n}_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a \leq 2(1-\alpha_n)$ for all $n \geq \bar{n}_2$. From (3.16), for all $n > \max\{n_2, \bar{n}_1, \bar{n}_2\}$, almost surely

$$m\left(f(x_n) - f^\star\right) \leq \frac{M_5}{a}\frac{o(\lambda_{n+m})}{\lambda_{n+m}} + \frac{N_4}{a}\frac{\alpha_n}{\lambda_n} + \frac{N_5}{a}\lambda_n + \frac{m(m+1)M_1}{2}\left(\sqrt{\bar{N}_1\alpha_n + \bar{N}_2\lambda_n} + \bar{N}_3\alpha_n\right),$$

which, together with (C4) (i.e., there exists $M \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\alpha_n \leq M\lambda_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$), completes the proof. □

Regarding Proposition 4.1, we have the following remark.

Remark 3.1. From a discussion similar to the one for obtaining (3.4) and (3.7), there exist $\bar{M}_i \in \mathbb{R}$ $(i = 1, 2)$ such that, for all $n > n_2$, almost surely

$$\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{\left\|x_{n+m(n)+1} - x_{n+1}\right\|}{\lambda_{n+m(n)}}\middle|\mathcal{F}_n\right] \leq \bar{M}_1 \prod_{k=n_2}^{n}\left(1-\alpha_{k+m(k)}\right) + \bar{M}_2 N(n), \tag{3.17}$$

where $N(n) := \max\{(1/\alpha_{k+m(k)})|(1/\lambda_k)-(1/\lambda_{k+m(k)})|, (1/\alpha_{k+m(k)})|(1/\lambda_{k+m(k)})-(1/\lambda_{k+m(k)-1})|, (1/\lambda_{k+m(k)})|1-\alpha_k/\alpha_{k+m(k)}| : k = n, n-1, \ldots, n_2\}$. Accordingly, (3.16) can be replaced with (3.17).

4 Stochastic proximal point algorithm for nonsmooth convex optimization

This section presents the convergence analysis of the following proximal-type algorithm for solving Problem 2.1.

Algorithm 4.1. Step 0. *Set a H-valued random variable x_0 and choose $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, (\gamma_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset (0,\infty)$.*

Step 1. *Compute x_{n+1} by*

$$y_n := T^{(w_n)}\left(\mathrm{Prox}_{\gamma_n f^{(w_n)}}(x_n)\right),$$
$$x_{n+1} := \alpha_n x_0 + (1-\alpha_n)y_n.$$

The value of n is then set to $n+1$, and the processing returns to Step 1.

Algorithms 3.1 and 4.1 are based on the Halpern fixed point algorithm [18, 44]. In contrast to Algorithm 3.1, Algorithm 4.1 uses the ideas of the proximal point algorithms [2, Chapter 27], [3, 5, 29, 30, 38, 43] that optimize nonsmooth, convex functions over the whole space.

4.1 Assumptions for convergence analysis of Algorithm 4.1

Let us consider Problem 2.1 under (A1), (A2), and (A4) defined as follows.

(A4) $\mathrm{Prox}_{\gamma f^{(i)}}$ $(\gamma > 0, i \in \mathcal{I})$ can be efficiently computed.

Tables 10.1 and 10.2 in [9] provide significant examples of convex functions for which proximity operators can be computed within a finite number of arithmetic operations.

The conditions of the step size sequences in Algorithm 4.1 are as follows.

Assumption 4.1. *Let $\sigma \geq 1$. The step size sequences $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset (0,1)$ and $(\gamma_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset (0,1)$, which are monotone decreasing and converge to 0, satisfy the following conditions:*

$$\text{(C1)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n = \infty,\ \text{(C2)} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_{n+1}} \left| \frac{1}{\gamma_{n+1}} - \frac{1}{\gamma_n} \right| = 0,\ \text{(C3)} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\gamma_{n+1}} \left| 1 - \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_{n+1}} \right| = 0,$$
$$\text{(C4)} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\alpha_n}{\gamma_n} = 0,\ \text{(C5)} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_{n+1}} \frac{|\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_n|}{\gamma_{n+1}^2} = 0,\ \text{(C6)} \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_{n+1}}, \frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_{n+1}} \leq \sigma\ (n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Examples of $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\gamma_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying Assumption 4.1 are $\gamma_n := 1/(n+1)^a$ and $\alpha_n := 1/(n+1)^b$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$, where $a \in (0, 1/2)$, $b \in (a, 1-a)$, and $a + b < 1$.

The convergence of Algorithm 4.1 depends on the following assumption.

Assumption 4.2. *The sequence $(w_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies Assumption 3.2, where λ_n is replaced with γ_n. The sequence $(y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is almost surely bounded.*

A similar discussion to the one for defining (3.2) leads to the finding that y_n $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ in Algorithm 4.1 can be replaced with

$$y_n := P_C \left[T^{(w_n)} \left(\mathrm{Prox}_{\gamma_n f^{(w_n)}}(x_n) \right) \right], \tag{4.1}$$

which implies the boundedness of $(y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Hence, it is assumed that y_n in Algorithm 4.1 is as in (4.1) in place of the almost sure boundedness of $(y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

4.2 Convergence analysis of Algorithm 4.1

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that Assumptions (A1), (A2), (A4), 4.1, and 4.2 hold, and let $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 4.1. Then, any weak sequential cluster point of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ almost surely belongs to the solution set of Problem 2.1.*

The proof starts with the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that the assumptions in Theorem 4.1 hold. Then, almost surely*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|}{\gamma_{n+m}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] = 0.$$

Proof. Sub-assumption 3.2(i) ensures that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $m(n) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} m(n) < \infty$, $T^{(w_{n+m})} = T^{(w_n)}$, and $f^{(w_{n+m})} = f^{(w_n)}$ almost surely. Accordingly, (A1) and the triangle inequality ensure that, for all $n \geq n_0$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_{n+m} - y_n\| \leq{}& \left\| \mathrm{Prox}_{\gamma_{n+m} f^{(w_n)}}(x_{n+m}) - \mathrm{Prox}_{\gamma_{n+m} f^{(w_n)}}(x_n) \right\| \\ &+ \left\| \mathrm{Prox}_{\gamma_{n+m} f^{(w_n)}}(x_n) - \mathrm{Prox}_{\gamma_n f^{(w_n)}}(x_n) \right\|, \end{aligned}$$

which, together with Proposition 2.2(ii), means that

$$\|y_{n+m} - y_n\| \leq \|x_{n+m} - x_n\| + \left\|\mathrm{Prox}_{\gamma_{n+m} f^{(w_n)}}(x_n) - \mathrm{Prox}_{\gamma_n f^{(w_n)}}(x_n)\right\|.$$

Put $z_n := \mathrm{Prox}_{\gamma_n f^{(w_n)}}(x_n)$ and $\bar{z}_n := \mathrm{Prox}_{\gamma_{n+m} f^{(w_n)}}(x_n)$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$. Proposition 2.2(i) thus means that $(x_n - z_n)/\gamma_n \in \partial f^{(w_n)}(z_n)$ and $(x_n - \bar{z}_n)/\gamma_{n+m} \in \partial f^{(w_n)}(\bar{z}_n)$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$. Hence, the monotonicity of $\partial f^{(w_n)}$ implies that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\langle z_n - \bar{z}_n, (x_n - z_n)/\gamma_n - (x_n - \bar{z}_n)/\gamma_{n+m} \rangle \geq 0$, which means that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\gamma_n \gamma_{n+m}} \big\{ &\langle z_n - \bar{z}_n, (\gamma_{n+m} - \gamma_n) x_n \rangle + \langle z_n - \bar{z}_n, -\gamma_{n+m}(z_n - \bar{z}_n) \rangle \\ &+ \langle z_n - \bar{z}_n, (\gamma_n - \gamma_{n+m}) \bar{z}_n \rangle \big\} \geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|z_n - \bar{z}_n\| \leq (|\gamma_{n+m} - \gamma_n|/\gamma_{n+m})(\|x_n\| + \|\bar{z}_n\|)$. Thus, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\|y_{n+m} - y_n\| \leq \|x_{n+m} - x_n\| + \frac{|\gamma_{n+m} - \gamma_n|}{\gamma_{n+m}} (\|x_n\| + \|\bar{z}_n\|).$$

A discussion similar to the one for obtaining (3.3) guarantees that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\| \leq (1 - \alpha_{n+m}) \|x_{n+m} - x_n\| &+ \frac{|\gamma_{n+m} - \gamma_n|}{\gamma_{n+m}} (\|x_n\| + \|\bar{z}_n\|) \\ &+ |\alpha_{n+m} - \alpha_n| \, \|x_0 - y_n\|.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the same discussion as for (3.4) implies that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|}{\gamma_{n+m}} \leq{}& (1 - \alpha_{n+m}) \frac{\|x_{n+m} - x_n\|}{\gamma_{n+m-1}} + \alpha_{n+m} \frac{1}{\gamma_{n+m}} \left| 1 - \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_{n+m}} \right| \|x_0 - y_n\| \\ &+ \alpha_{n+m} \frac{1}{\alpha_{n+m}} \left| \frac{1}{\gamma_{n+m}} - \frac{1}{\gamma_{n+m-1}} \right| \|x_{n+m} - x_n\| \\ &+ \alpha_{n+m} \frac{1}{\alpha_{n+m}} \frac{|\gamma_{n+m} - \gamma_n|}{\gamma_{n+m}^2} (\|x_n\| + \|\bar{z}_n\|).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the proof of Lemma 3.1, Sub-assumption 3.2(i), and Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2 lead to the assertion in Lemma 4.1. This completes the proof. □

Next, the following lemma is considered.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that the assumptions in Theorem 4.1 hold and* $z_n := \mathrm{Prox}_{\gamma_n f^{(w_n)}}(x_n)$ *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$. *Then, almost surely*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathrm{E}\left[\|x_n - z_n\|^2 \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_n \right] = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathrm{E}\left[\left\| x_n - T^{(w_n)}(x_n) \right\|^2 \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_n \right] = 0.$$

Proof. Choose $x \in X$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ arbitrarily and define $z_k := \mathrm{Prox}_{\gamma_k f^{(w_k)}}(x_k)$ $(k \in \mathbb{N})$. Proposition 2.2(i) thus ensures that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\langle x - z_k, x_k - z_k \rangle \leq \gamma_k (f^{(w_k)}(x) - f^{(w_k)}(z_k))$, which, together with $\langle x, y \rangle = (1/2)(\|x\|^2 + \|y\|^2 - \|x - y\|^2)$ $(x, y \in H)$, means that

$$\|z_k - x\|^2 \leq \|x_k - x\|^2 - \|z_k - x_k\|^2 + 2\gamma_k \left(f^{(w_k)}(x) - f^{(w_k)}(z_k) \right).$$

Since the convexity of $\|\cdot\|^2$ and (A1) mean that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|x_{k+1}-x\|^2 \leq \alpha_k\|x_0-x\|^2 + \|z_k-x\|^2 - (1-\alpha_k)\|z_k - T^{(w_k)}(z_k)\|^2$, we also have that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|x_{k+1}-x\|^2 \leq \alpha_k \|x_0-x\|^2 + \|x_k-x\|^2 - \|z_k-x_k\|^2 + 2\gamma_k\left(f^{(w_k)}(x) - f^{(w_k)}(z_k)\right) \\ - (1-\alpha_k)\left\|z_k - T^{(w_k)}(z_k)\right\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Furthermore, the definition of $\partial f^{(i)}$ $(i \in \mathcal{I})$ and Proposition 2.2(iii) imply that there exists $K_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\|x_{k+1}-x\|^2 \leq \alpha_k \|x_0-x\|^2 + \|x_k-x\|^2 - \|z_k-x_k\|^2 + 2K_1\gamma_k\|x-z_k\| \\ - (1-\alpha_k)\left\|z_k - T^{(w_k)}(z_k)\right\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Accordingly,

$$\begin{aligned}\|x_{n+m+1}-x\|^2 \leq \|x_{n+1}-x\|^2 + \|x_0-x\|^2\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\alpha_k - \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\|z_k-x_k\|^2 \\ + 2K_1\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\gamma_k\|x-z_k\| - \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}(1-\alpha_k)\left\|z_k - T^{(w_k)}(z_k)\right\|^2,\end{aligned}$$

which means that

$$\begin{aligned}\|z_{n+1}-x_{n+1}\|^2 \leq \|x_0-x\|^2\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\alpha_k + 2K_1\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\gamma_k\|x-z_k\| \\ + \gamma_{n+m}\left(\|x_{n+1}-x\| + \|x_{n+m+1}-x\|\right)\frac{\|x_{n+1}-x_{n+m+1}\|}{\gamma_{n+m}},\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(1-\alpha_{n+1})\left\|z_{n+1} - T^{(w_{n+1})}(z_{n+1})\right\|^2 \leq \|x_0-x\|^2\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\alpha_k + 2K_1\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\gamma_k\|x-z_k\| \\ + \gamma_{n+m}\left(\|x_{n+1}-x\| + \|x_{n+m+1}-x\|\right)\frac{\|x_{n+1}-x_{n+m+1}\|}{\gamma_{n+m}}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Therefore, from a discussion similar to the one for obtaining (3.10), Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2, and Lemma 4.1 lead to that, almost surely $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathrm{E}[\|z_n-x_n\|^2|\mathcal{F}_n] = 0$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathrm{E}[\|z_n - T^{(w_n)}(z_n)\|^2|\mathcal{F}_n] = 0$. Since (A1) and $\|x+y\|^2 \leq 2\|x\|^2 + 2\|y\|^2$ $(x, y \in H)$ guarantee that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|x_n - T^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right\|^2 &\leq 2\|x_n-z_n\|^2 + 2\left\|z_n - T^{(w_n)}(x_n)\right\|^2 \\ &\leq 6\|x_n-z_n\|^2 + 4\left\|z_n - T^{(w_n)}(z_n)\right\|^2,\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

we have that, almost surely $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathrm{E}[\|x_n - T^{(w_n)}(x_n)\|^2|\mathcal{F}_n] = 0$. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 4.2 leads to the following.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that the assumptions in Theorem 4.1 hold. Then, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, almost surely*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\left\|x_n - T^{(i)}(x_n)\right\| = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty}\|x_n - z_n\| = 0.$$

Proof. The same discussion as for proving Lemma 3.3 guarantees that, almost surely $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|x_n - T^{(i)}(x_n)\| = 0$ ($i \in \mathcal{I}$). Lemma 4.1 ensures that $(\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|/\gamma_{n+m})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded almost surely. Hence, (4.3) and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \gamma_n = 0$ guarantee that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|x_n - z_n\|$ almost surely equals 0. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 4.3 leads to the following.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose that the assumptions in Theorem 4.1 hold. Then, almost surely*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} f(x_n) \leq f^\star := \min_{x\in X} f(x).$$

Moreover, any weak sequential cluster point of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ almost surely belongs to $X^\star := \{x^\star \in X \colon f(x^\star) = f^\star\}$.

Proof. Choose $x^\star \in X^\star$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ arbitrarily. Inequality (4.2) guarantees that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|x_{k+1} - x^\star\|^2 \leq \alpha_k \|x_0 - x^\star\|^2 + \|x_k - x^\star\|^2 + 2\gamma_k \left(f^{(w_k)}(x^\star) - f^{(w_k)}(x_k)\right) \\ + 2\gamma_k \left(f^{(w_k)}(x_k) - f^{(w_k)}(z_k)\right),\end{aligned}$$

which, together with the nonempty condition of $\partial f^{(w_k)}(x_k)$ and the triangle inequality, implies that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\bar{u}_k \in \partial f^{(w_k)}(x_k)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\|x_{k+1} - x^\star\|^2 \leq \alpha_k \|x_0 - x^\star\|^2 + \|x_k - x^\star\|^2 + 2\gamma_k \left(f^{(w_k)}(x^\star) - f^{(w_k)}(x_k)\right) \\ + 2\gamma_k \|\bar{u}_k\| \|x_k - z_k\|.\end{aligned}$$

Accordingly,

$$\begin{aligned}\|x_{n+m+1} - x^\star\|^2 \leq \|x_{n+1} - x^\star\|^2 + 2\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \gamma_k \left(f^{(w_k)}(x^\star) - f^{(w_k)}(x_k)\right) \\ + \|x_0 - x^\star\|^2 \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \alpha_k + 2\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \gamma_k \|\bar{u}_k\| \|x_k - z_k\|.\end{aligned}$$

A discussion similar to the one for obtaining (3.12) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{2}{\gamma_{n+m}} \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \gamma_k \left(f^{(w_k)}(x_k) - f^{(w_k)}(x^\star)\right) \\ &\leq (\|x_{n+1} - x^\star\| + \|x_{n+m+1} - x^\star\|) \frac{\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|}{\gamma_{n+m}} + \frac{\|x_0 - x^\star\|^2}{\gamma_{n+m}} \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \alpha_k \qquad (4.6) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{\gamma_{n+m}} \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} \gamma_k \|\bar{u}_k\| \|x_k - z_k\|.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the same discussion as for the proof of Lemma 3.4, together with Lemma 4.3 and Assumptions 3.2 and 4.1, leads to the finding that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} f(x_n) \leq f^\star$ almost surely. Furthermore, the same discussion as for the proof of Theorem 3.1, together with Assumption 4.2 and Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4, guarantees that any weak sequential cluster point of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ belongs to $X^\star$ almost surely. This means that Theorem 4.1 holds. □

4.3 Convergence rate analysis of Algorithm 4.1

The following proposition establishes the rate of convergence for Algorithm 4.1.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that the assumptions in Theorem 4.1 hold and that $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is the sequence generated by Algorithm 4.1. Then, there exist $K_i \in \mathbb{R}$ $(i = 1, 2)$ such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely*

$$\left\|x_n - T^{(i)}(x_n)\right\| \leq \sqrt{K_1\alpha_n + K_2\gamma_n}.$$

Moreover, under Sub-assumption 3.2(iii), if there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f(x_n) \geq f^\star$ almost surely for all $n \geq k_0$, then there exist $k_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $K_i \in \mathbb{R}$ $(i = 3, 4, 5, 6)$ such that, for all $n \geq \max\{k_0, k_1\}$, almost surely

$$\frac{1}{m}\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} f(x_k) - f^\star \leq K_3\frac{o(\gamma_{n+m})}{\gamma_{n+m}} + K_4\frac{\alpha_n}{\gamma_n} + \sqrt{K_5\alpha_n + K_6\gamma_n}.$$

Under Sub-assumption 3.2(iv), there exist $K_i \in \mathbb{R}$ $(i = 7, 8, 9, 10)$ such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$f(x_n) - f^\star \leq K_7\frac{o(\gamma_{n+m})}{\gamma_{n+m}} + K_8\frac{\alpha_n}{\gamma_n} + \sqrt{K_9\alpha_n + K_{10}\gamma_n}.$$

Proof. Since (4.3) and (4.4) hold, the almost sure boundedness of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and the monotone decreasing conditions of $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\gamma_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $\lim_{n\to\infty}\alpha_n = 0$ mean the existence of $K_i \in \mathbb{R}$ $(i = 2, 3)$ such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\mathrm{E}\left[\|z_n - x_n\|^2 \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_n\right] \leq K_2\alpha_n + K_3\gamma_n,\ \mathrm{E}\left[\left\|z_n - T^{(w_n)}(z_n)\right\|^2 \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_n\right] \leq K_2\alpha_n + K_3\gamma_n,$$

which, together with (4.5) and the existence of $K_4 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|x_n - T^{(i)}(x_n)\|^2 \leq K_4\mathrm{E}[\|x_n - T^{(w_n)}(x_n)\|^2|\mathcal{F}_n]$ almost surely (see Sub-assumption 3.2(ii)), means that, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\left\|x_n - T^{(i)}(x_n)\right\|^2 \leq 10K_4\left(K_2\alpha_n + K_3\gamma_n\right).$$

The same discussion as for obtaining (3.16) means that, almost surely

$$\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|}{\gamma_{n+m}}\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_n\right] = \frac{o(\gamma_{n+m})}{\gamma_{n+m}}. \tag{4.7}$$

Let us assume that Sub-assumption 3.2(iii) holds. Lemma 4.1, the almost sure boundedness of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, and (4.3) imply that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely $\|x_n - z_n\| \leq \sqrt{K_2\alpha_n + K_3\gamma_n}$. Taking the expectation in (4.6) conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_n$ thus guarantees that there exist $K_i \in \mathbb{R}$ $(i = 7, 8, 9)$ such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\frac{2}{\gamma_{n+m}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\gamma_k\left(f(x_k) - f^\star\right) \leq K_7\frac{o(\gamma_{n+m})}{\gamma_{n+m}} + \frac{K_8}{\gamma_{n+m}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\alpha_k + \frac{2K_9}{\gamma_{n+m}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\gamma_k\sqrt{K_2\alpha_k + K_3\gamma_k},$$

where $K_9 := \max_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\sup\{\|u_n^{(i)}\| \colon u_n^{(i)} \in \partial f^{(i)}(x_n), n \in \mathbb{N}\} < \infty$ comes from the almost sure boundedness of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and Proposition 2.2(iii). Accordingly, from the existence of $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$

such that $f(x_n) - f^\star \geq 0$ almost surely for all $n \geq m_0$, (3.14), and the monotone decreasing conditions of $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\gamma_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, there exist $K_i \in \mathbb{R}$ $(i = 10, 11)$ such that, for all $n \geq m_0$, almost surely

$$\frac{1}{m}\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} f(x_k) - f^\star \leq \frac{K_7}{m}\frac{o(\gamma_{n+m})}{\gamma_{n+m}} + \frac{K_{10}}{m}\frac{\alpha_n}{\gamma_n} + K_{11}\sqrt{K_2\alpha_n + K_3\gamma_n}.$$

Next, let us assume that Sub-assumption 3.2(iv) holds. From (4.6) and the definition of $\partial f^{(w_k)}$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
&2\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\left(f^{(w_k)}(x_n) - f^{(w_k)}(x^\star)\right) \\
&\leq \left(\|x_{n+1} - x^\star\| + \|x_{n+m+1} - x^\star\|\right)\frac{\|x_{n+m+1} - x_{n+1}\|}{\gamma_{n+m}} + \frac{\|x_0 - x^\star\|^2 m\alpha_{n+m}}{\gamma_{n+m}} \qquad (4.8)\\
&\quad + 2K_9\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\|x_k - z_k\| + 2K_9\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\|x_n - x_k\|.
\end{aligned}$$

From (4.3) and (4.4), the triangle inequality means that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_{n+1} - x_n\| &\leq \|x_{n+1} - y_n\| + \left\|T^{(w_n)}(z_n) - z_n\right\| + \|z_n - x_n\| \\
&\leq \alpha_n\|x_0 - y_n\| + 2\sqrt{K_2\alpha_n + K_3\gamma_n},
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with the triangle inequality and the monotone decreasing conditions of $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\gamma_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, means that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m}\|x_n - x_k\| &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{m-1}(m-j)\|x_{n+j} - x_{n+j+1}\| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=0}^{m-1}(m-j)\left(K_{11}\alpha_{n+j} + 2\sqrt{K_2\alpha_{n+j} + K_3\gamma_{n+j}}\right) \\
&\leq \frac{m(m+1)}{2}\left(K_{11}\alpha_n + 2\sqrt{K_2\alpha_n + K_3\gamma_n}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $K_{11} := \sup\{\|x_0 - y_n\| \colon n \in \mathbb{N}\} < \infty$ almost surely. Taking the expectation in (4.8) conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_n$ thus guarantees that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
m\left(f(x_n) - f^\star\right) &\leq K_7\frac{o(\gamma_{n+m})}{\gamma_{n+m}} + K_{10}\frac{\alpha_n}{\gamma_n} \\
&\quad + mK_8\sqrt{K_2\alpha_n + K_3\gamma_n} + \frac{m(m+1)}{2}K_8\left(K_{11}\alpha_n + 2\sqrt{K_2\alpha_n + K_3\gamma_n}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (C4), completes the proof. □

Remark 4.1. A discussion similar to the one for obtaining (3.17) ensures that there exist $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\bar{K}_i \in \mathbb{R}$ $(i = 1, 2)$ such that, for all $n > m_0$, almost surely

$$\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{\left\|x_{n+m(n)+1} - x_{n+1}\right\|}{\gamma_{n+m(n)}}\middle|\mathcal{F}_n\right] \leq \bar{K}_1\prod_{k=m_0}^{n}\left(1 - \alpha_{k+m(k)}\right) + \bar{K}_2 N(n), \qquad (4.9)$$

where $N(n) := \max\{(1/\gamma_{k+m(k)})|1-\alpha_k/\alpha_{k+m(k)}|, (1/\alpha_{k+m(k)})|(1/\gamma_{k+m(k)})-(1/\gamma_{k+m(k)-1})|, (1/\alpha_{k+m(k)})|\gamma_{k+m(k)}-\gamma_k|/\gamma^2_{k+m(k)} \colon k = n, n-1, \ldots, m_0\}$. Accordingly, (4.7) can be replaced with (4.9).

5 Numerical results

This section considers Problem 2.1 when $f^{(i)}\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and $T^{(i)}\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ ($i \in \mathcal{I}$) are defined for all $x := (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$f^{(i)}(x) := \frac{1}{2}\left\langle x, A^{(i)}x\right\rangle + \left\langle b^{(i)}, x\right\rangle \text{ or } \sum_{j\in\mathcal{D}} \omega_j^{(i)} \left|x_j - a_j^{(i)}\right|,$$
$$T^{(i)}(x) := \frac{1}{2}\left[x + P_C\left(\frac{1}{K}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}} P_{C_k^{(i)}}(x)\right)\right], \tag{5.1}$$

where $A^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ is a diagonal matrix with diagonal components $\lambda_j^{(i)} \geq 0$, $b^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\omega_j^{(i)} > 0$, $a_j^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}$, $r_k^{(i)} > 0$, $c_k^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $C_k^{(i)} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d\colon \|x - c_k^{(i)}\| \leq r_k^{(i)}\}$ ($i \in \mathcal{I}, k \in \mathcal{K} := \{1, 2, \ldots, K\}, j \in \mathcal{D} := \{1, 2, \ldots, d\}$), and $C := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d\colon \|x\| \leq 1\}$.

Since the metric projection onto each of C and $C_k^{(i)}$ ($i \in \mathcal{I}, k \in \mathcal{K}$) can be computed within a finite number of arithmetic operations, $T^{(i)}$ ($i \in \mathcal{I}$) defined by (5.1) can be computed efficiently. Moreover, $T^{(i)}$ ($i \in \mathcal{I}$) satisfies the firm nonexpansivity condition (see (A1)), and $\mathrm{Fix}(T^{(i)})$ coincides with a subset of C with the elements closest to $C_k^{(i)}$s in terms of the mean square norm [46, Proposition 4.2]. This subset, denoted by $C_\Phi^{(i)} := \{x \in C\colon \Phi^{(i)}(x) := (1/K)\sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}}(\min_{z\in C_k^{(i)}} \|x - z\|)^2 = \min_{y\in C} \Phi^{(i)}(y)\}$ ($= \mathrm{Fix}(T^{(i)})$), is called the *generalized convex feasible set* [8, 46], which is well defined even when $C \cap \bigcap_{k\in\mathcal{K}} C_k^{(i)} = \emptyset$ (see [8, 20, 26, 46] for applications of the generalized convex feasible set). The boundedness of C guarantees that $\mathrm{Fix}(T^{(i)}) = C_\Phi^{(i)} \neq \emptyset$ [46, Remark 4.3(a)].

The experimental evaluations of the two proposed algorithms were done using a 13-inch MacBook Air with a 2.20 GHz Intel Core i7 processor and 8 GB 1600 MHz DDR3 memory. The algorithms were written in Java 1.8.0_66-b17 with $d := 2^{10} = 1024$, $I := 16$, and $K := 3$. The values of $\lambda_j^{(i)} \in [0, d]$, $b^{(i)} \in [-1, 1]^d$, $\omega_j^{(i)} \in (0, 1]$, $a_j^{(i)} \in [-1, 1]$, $r_k^{(i)} \in (0, 1]$, and $c_k^{(i)} \in [-1/\sqrt{d}, 1/\sqrt{d})^d$ were randomly generated using the Mersenne Twister pseudorandom number generator (provided by Apache Commons Math 3.6). Algorithm 3.1 (resp. Algorithm 4.1) was used with (3.2) (resp. (4.1)), which implies the boundedness of $(y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ (see Assumptions 3.3 and 4.2). The step size sequences were $\lambda_n = \gamma_n := 10^{-3}/(n + 1)^a$ and $\alpha_n := 10^{-3}/(n + 1)^b$, where (a, b) is (A) $(1/4, 1/2)$ or (B) $(1/8, 3/4)$, which satisfy Assumptions 3.1 and 4.1.[2]

To see how the choice of $(w_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ affects the convergence rate of the two algorithms, Algorithms 3.1 and 4.1 with one of the following were used in the experiment.

(I) The samples were generated nearly independently; i.e., there existed $\rho \in (0, 1]$ such that, almost surely $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathrm{P}(w_n = i|\mathcal{F}_n) \geq \rho/I$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

(II) The samples were selected to be nonexpansive mappings of which the fixed point sets were the most distant from the current iterates; i.e., $w_n = \mathrm{argmax}_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \|x_n - T^{(i)}(x_n)\|^2$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

(III) The samples were generated in accordance with a random permutation of the indexes within a cycle; i.e., for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $(T^{(w_n)})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, where $n = tI, tI + 1, \ldots, (t + 1)I - 1$, was a permutation of $\{T^{(1)}, T^{(2)}, \ldots, T^{(I)}\}$.

[2]Existing fixed point optimization algorithms [23, 24] with small step sizes (e.g., $\gamma_n := 10^{-2}/(n + 1)^a, 10^{-3}/(n + 1)^a$) have faster convergence. Hence, the experiment used step sizes $\lambda_n = \gamma_n := 10^{-3}/(n + 1)^a$ and $\alpha_n := 10^{-3}/(n + 1)^b$.

(IV) The samples were generated through state transitions of a Markov chain; i.e., $(w_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ was generated using an irreducible and aperiodic Markov chain with states $1, 2, \ldots, I$.

Conditions (I)–(IV) were defined on the basis of Assumptions 4–7 in [43]. The conclusions in [43] show that the sequence $(w_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in each of (I)–(IV) satisfies Sub-assumptions 3.2(i) and (ii). In the experiment, $\rho := 1$ in (I) was set, and $(w_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in (IV) was generated using a positive Markov matrix with randomly chosen elements.

One hundred samplings, each starting from a different randomly chosen initial point, were performed, and the results were averaged. Two performance measures were used. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$D_n := \frac{1}{100}\sum_{s=1}^{100}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\left\|x_n(s) - T^{(i)}\left(x_n(s)\right)\right\| \text{ and } F_n := \frac{1}{100}\sum_{s=1}^{100}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} f^{(i)}\left(x_n(s)\right),$$

where $(x_n(s))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is the sequence generated from initial point $x(s)$ $(s = 1, 2, \ldots, 100)$ for each of the two algorithms. The value of D_n represents the mean value of the sums of the distances between $x_n(s)$ and $T^{(i)}(x_n(s))$. Hence, if $(D_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to 0, $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to some point in $\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\mathrm{Fix}(T^{(i)}) = \bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}} C_\Phi^{(i)}$. Let $x^\star \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the convergence point of the proposed algorithms and let $F^\star := \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} f^{(i)}(x^\star)$. If $(F_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $F^\star$, $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to a solution to the problem considered in this section. The stopping condition in the experiment was $n = 1000$.

First, let us consider the problem when $f^{(i)}(x) := (1/2)\langle x, A^{(i)}x\rangle + \langle b^{(i)}, x\rangle$ $(i \in \mathcal{I})$ (i.e., $f^{(i)}$ is smooth and convex), which can be solved using Algorithm 3.1. Table 1 shows the number of iterations n and elapsed time when Algorithm 3.1 with one of (I)–(IV) and one of (A) and (B) satisfied $D_n \le 10^{-3}$ and $|F_n - F^\star| \le 10^{-3}$. Although all the algorithms converged to a point in $\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\mathrm{Fix}(T^{(i)})$ in the early stages, $(F_n)_{n=0}^{1000}$ generated by Algorithm 3.1(II) did not converge to $F^\star$. If there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_{n_0} \in \bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\mathrm{Fix}(T^{(i)})$ (i.e., $\|x_{n_0} - T^{(i)}(x_{n_0})\| = 0$ $(i \in \mathcal{I})$), the variable w_n $(n \ge n_0)$ cannot be used under the condition $w_n = \mathrm{argmax}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\|x_n - T^{(i)}(x_n)\|^2$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$. This means that Algorithm 3.1(II) cannot be implemented after it finds a point in $\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\mathrm{Fix}(T^{(i)})$. Except for Algorithm 3.1(II), the algorithms converged to a solution to Problem 2.1. In particular, Algorithm 3.1(III)(A) (resp. Algorithm 3.1(III)(B)) performed better than Algorithms 3.1(I), (II), and (IV) with (A) (resp. Algorithms 3.1(I), (II), and (IV) with (B)).

Table 1: Behavior of D_n and F_n for Algorithm 3.1 ($F^\star \approx 0.33$)

	$D_n \le 10^{-3}$			$\lvert F_n - F^\star\rvert \le 10^{-3}$		
	n	time [s]	D_n	n	time [s]	F_n
Alg.3.1(I)(A)	6	0.000089	0.00000000	287	0.003076	0.33050247
Alg.3.1(I)(B)	6	0.000078	0.00000000	567	0.006120	0.32920799
Alg.3.1(II)(A)	6	0.001186	0.00000000	–	–	–
Alg.3.1(II)(B)	5	0.001036	0.00010032	–	–	–
Alg.3.1(III)(A)	5	0.000067	0.00000000	135	0.001454	0.32961545
Alg.3.1(III)(B)	4	0.000060	0.00000000	94	0.000993	0.33015361
Alg.3.1(IV)(A)	5	0.000073	0.00006533	292	0.003198	0.33086516
Alg.3.1(IV)(B)	5	0.000069	0.00000000	763	0.008405	0.32904925

Next, let us consider the case in which $f^{(i)}(x) := \sum_{j\in\mathcal{D}} \omega_j^{(i)}|x_j - a_j^{(i)}|$ $(i \in \mathcal{I})$ (i.e., $f^{(i)}$ is nonsmooth and convex), which can be solved using Algorithm 4.1. Table 2 shows that all the algorithms converged to a solution to Problem 2.1 before the stopping condition was reached. In contrast to Algorithm 3.1, Algorithm 4.1(II) approximated a point in $\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \mathrm{Fix}(T^{(i)})$ and converged to a solution to Problem 2.1. The elapsed time for computing x_{771} with Algorithm 4.1(III)(A) (resp. x_{189} with Algorithm 4.1(III)(B)) was 0.009486 [s] (resp. 0.002245 [s]). Therefore, when Algorithm 4.1 had the same step sizes, Algorithm 4.1(III) converged faster than the other algorithms, as shown in Table 1.

Table 2: Behavior of D_n and F_n for Algorithm 4.1 ($F^\star \approx 3.07$)

	$D_n \le 10^{-2}$			$\lvert F_n - F^\star\rvert \le 10^{-3}$		
	n	time [s]	D_n	n	time [s]	F_n
Alg.4.1(I)(A)	930	0.011068	0.00990405	570	0.006948	3.07097529
Alg.4.1(I)(B)	112	0.001455	0.00999075	191	0.002390	3.07096339
Alg.4.1(II)(A)	770	0.134329	0.00999330	499	0.088080	3.07098589
Alg.4.1(II)(B)	46	0.008110	0.00987091	173	0.028750	3.07094931
Alg.4.1(III)(A)	771	0.009486	0.00996120	577	0.007201	3.07090915
Alg.4.1(III)(B)	96	0.001195	0.00976861	189	0.002245	3.07089791
Alg.4.1(IV)(A)	976	0.011957	0.00999778	660	0.008277	3.07099945
Alg.4.1(IV)(B)	121	0.001588	0.00978988	214	0.002664	3.07098641

6 Conclusion

Two stochastic optimization algorithms were proposed for solving the problem of minimizing the expected value of convex functions over the intersection of fixed point sets of nonexpansive mappings on a real Hilbert space. One algorithm blends a stochastic gradient method with the Halpern fixed point algorithm while the other is based on a stochastic proximal point algorithm and the Halpern fixed point algorithm. Consideration of a case in which the step-size sequences are diminishing demonstrated that any weak sequential cluster point of the sequence generated by each of the two algorithms almost surely belongs to the solution set of the problem under certain assumptions. Convergence rate analysis of the two algorithms illustrated their efficiency. A discussion of concrete convex optimization over fixed point sets and the numerical results demonstrated their effectiveness.

Acknowledgments. I thank Kazuhiro Hishinuma for his input on the numerical examples.

References

[1] Bastin, F., Cirillo, C., Toint, P.L.: Convergence theory for nonconvex stochastic programming with an application to mixed logit. Mathematical Programming **108**, 207–234 (2006)

[2] Bauschke, H.H., Combettes, P.L.: Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces. Springer (2011)

[3] Bačák, M.: Computing medians and means in Hadamard spaces. SIAM Journal on Optimization **24**, 1542–1566 (2014)

[4] Berkelaar, A., Gromicho, J.A.S., Kouwenberg, R., Zhang, S.: A primal-dual decomposition algorithm for multistage stochastic convex programming. Mathematical Programming **104**, 153–177 (2005)

[5] Bertsekas, D.P.: Incremental proximal methods for large scale convex optimization. Mathematical Programming **129**, 163–195 (2011)

[6] Borkar, V.S.: Stochastic Approximation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2008)

[7] Combettes, P.L.: A block-iterative surrogate constraint splitting method for quadratic signal recovery. IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing **51**(7), 1771–1782 (2003)

[8] Combettes, P.L., Bondon, P.: Hard-constrained inconsistent signal feasibility problems. IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing **47**(9), 2460–2468 (1999)

[9] Combettes, P.L., Pesquet, J.C.: Proximal splitting methods in signal processing. In: H.H. Bauschke, R.S. Burachik, P.L. Combettes, V. Elser, D.R. Luke, H. Wolkowicz (eds.) Fixed-Point Algorithms for Inverse Problems in Science and Engineering, pp. 185–212. Springer (2011)

[10] Combettes, P.L., Pesquet, J.C.: Stochastic quasi-Fejér block-coordinate fixed point iterations with random sweeping. SIAM Journal on Optimization **25**, 1221–1248 (2015)

[11] Combettes, P.L., Pesquet, J.C.: Stochastic approximations and perturbations in forward-backward splitting for monotone operators. Pure and Applied Functional Analysis **1**, 13–37 (2016)

[12] Dyer, M., Kannan, R., Stougie, L.: A simple randomised algorithm for convex optimisation. Mathematical Programming **147**, 207–229 (2014)

[13] Ghadimi, S., Lan, G.: Optimal stochastic approximation algorithms for strongly convex stochastic composite optimization I: A generic algorithmic framework. SIAM Journal on Optimization **22**, 1469–1492 (2012)

[14] Ghadimi, S., Lan, G.: Optimal stochastic approximation algorithms for strongly convex stochastic composite optimization, II: Shrinking procedures and optimal algorithms. SIAM Journal on Optimization **23**, 2061–2089 (2013)

[15] Ghadimi, S., Lan, G.: Stochastic first- and zeroth-order methods for nonconvex stochastic programming. SIAM Journal on Optimization **23**, 2341–2368 (2013)

[16] Ghadimi, S., Lan, G.: Accelerated gradient methods for nonconvex nonlinear and stochastic programming. Mathematical Programming **156**, 59–99 (2016)

[17] Ghadimi, S., Lan, G., Zhang, H.: Mini-batch stochastic approximation methods for nonconvex stochastic composite optimization. Mathematical Programming (to appear)

[18] Halpern, B.: Fixed points of nonexpanding maps. Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society **73**, 957–961 (1967)

[19] Iiduka, H.: Iterative algorithm for solving triple-hierarchical constrained optimization problem. Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications **148**, 580–592 (2011)

[20] Iiduka, H.: Iterative algorithm for triple-hierarchical constrained nonconvex optimization problem and its application to network bandwidth allocation. SIAM Journal on Optimization **22**(3), 862–878 (2012)

[21] Iiduka, H.: Fixed point optimization algorithms for distributed optimization in networked systems. SIAM Journal on Optimization **23**, 1–26 (2013)

[22] Iiduka, H.: Acceleration method for convex optimization over the fixed point set of a nonexpansive mapping. Mathematical Programming **149**, 131–165 (2015)

[23] Iiduka, H.: Convergence analysis of iterative methods for nonsmooth convex optimization over fixed point sets of quasi-nonexpansive mappings. Mathematical Programming (to appear) (2016)

[24] Iiduka, H.: Proximal point algorithms for nonsmooth convex optimization with fixed point constraints. European Journal of Operational Research (to appear) (2016)

[25] Iiduka, H., Hishinuma, K.: Acceleration method combining broadcast and incremental optimization algorithms. SIAM Journal on Optimization **24**, 1840–1863 (2014)

[26] Iiduka, H., Yamada, I.: Computational method for solving a stochastic linear-quadratic control problem given an unsolvable stochastic algebraic Riccati equation. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization **50**, 2173–2192 (2012)

[27] Lan, G.: An optimal method for stochastic composite optimization. Mathematical Programming **133**, 365–397 (2012)

[28] Lee, S., Nedić, A.: Distributed random projection algorithm for convex optimization. IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing **7**, 221–229 (2013)

[29] Lions, P.L., Mercier, B.: Splitting algorithms for the sum of two nonlinear operators. SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis **16**(6), 964–979 (1979)

[30] Martinet, B.: Régularisation d'inéquations variationnelles par approximations successives. Revue Française d'informatique et de Recherche Opérationnelle **4**(3), 154–159 (1970)

[31] Minty, G.J.: A theorem on maximal monotonic sets in Hilbert space. Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications **11**, 434–439 (1965)

[32] Moreau, J.J.: Fonctions convexes duales et points proximaux dans un espace hilbertien. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A Math. **255**, 2897–2899 (1962)

[33] Nedić, A.: Random algorithms for convex minimization problems. Mathematical Programming **129**, 225–253 (2011)

[34] Nedić, A., Bertsekas, D.P.: Incremental sugradient methods for nondifferentiable optimization. SIAM Journal on Optimization **12**, 109–138 (2001)

[35] Needell, D., Srebro, N., Ward, R.: Stochastic gradient descent, weighted sampling, and the randomized Kaczmarz algorithm. Mathematical Programming **155**, 549–573 (2016)

[36] Nemirovski, A., Juditsky, A., Lan, G., Shapiro, A.: Robust stochastic approximation approach to stochastic programming. SIAM Journal on Optimization **19**, 1574–1609 (2009)

[37] Opial, Z.: Weak convergence of the sequence of successive approximation for nonexpansive mappings. Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society **73**, 591–597 (1967)

[38] Rockafellar, R.T.: Monotone operators and the proximal point algorithm. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization **14**(5), 877–898 (1976)

[39] Royset, J.O.: Optimality functions in stochastic programming. Mathematical Programming **135**, 293–321 (2012)

[40] Shapiro, A.: Stochastic programming approach to optimization under uncertainty. Mathematical Programming **112**, 183–220 (2008)

[41] Slavakis, K., Yamada, I.: Robust wideband beamforming by the hybrid steepest descent method. IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing **55**(9), 4511–4522 (2007)

[42] Sundhar Ram, S., Nedić, A., Veeravalli, V.V.: Incremental stochastic subgradient algorithms for convex optimization. SIAM Journal on Optimization **20**, 691–717 (2009)

[43] Wang, M., Bertsekas, D.P.: Incremental constraint projection-proximal methods for nonsmooth convex optimization. SIAM Journal on Optimization (to appear) (2015)

[44] Wittmann, R.: Approximation of fixed points of nonexpansive mappings. Archiv der Mathematik **58**(5), 486–491 (1992)

[45] Xu, Y., Yin, W.: Block stochastic gradient iteration for convex and nonconvex optimization. SIAM Journal on Optimization **25**, 1686–1716 (2015)

[46] Yamada, I.: The hybrid steepest descent method for the variational inequality problem over the intersection of fixed point sets of nonexpansive mappings. In: D. Butnariu, Y. Censor, S. Reich (eds.) Inherently Parallel Algorithms for Feasibility and Optimization and Their Applications, pp. 473–504. Elsevier (2001)

[47] Yamada, I., Yukawa, M., Yamagishi, M.: Minimizing the Moreau envelope of nonsmooth convex functions over the fixed point set of certain quasi-nonexpansive mappings. In: H.H. Bauschke, R.S. Burachik, P.L. Combettes, V. Elser, D.R. Luke, H. Wolkowicz (eds.) Fixed-Point Algorithms for Inverse Problems in Science and Engineering, pp. 345–390. Springer (2011)

[48] Zhao, G.: A Lagrangian dual method with self-concordant barriers for multi-stage stochastic convex programming. Mathematical Programming **102**, 1–24 (2005)